

[17th July 1952]

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—VOTING ON DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1952-53—*cont.*

(1) DEMAND II—STATE EXCISE DUTIES—*cont.*

11-30 THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker,
a.m. Sir, . . . "

SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH:—" On a point of order, Sir, బడ్జెటు ప్రతిపాదనలకు సభ్యులను కోత తీర్మానాలను ఇవ్వమన్నారు. కోత తీర్మానాలు పంపిన వారిలో చాలామందికి మాట్లాడుటకు అవకాశం కలగలేదు కాబట్టి కోత తీర్మానములలోని విషయములన్నిటినీ కోడికరించి మౌనంగా వర్తకు సమాధానం ఇచ్చే సందర్భంలో ఈ కోత తీర్మానాలకు సరియైన సమాధానం మంతులు ఇవ్వవలసి నదనే సత్సంగపదాయాలన్ని స్వీకరించారు ఏర్పాటుజేయవలసినదని కోరుతున్నాను. లేనిచో ఈ కోత తీర్మానాలు కుంపుట, వాటిని అడ్డువేయుట అనేవన్నీ దండుగే అశ్రుతాయి."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—" Sir, I shall explain his idea. He says, everyone has given notice of a number of cut motions, but only a few are allowed to speak because there is no time. He expects the Hon. the Chief Minister to go through the cut motions and give reply to all the points raised in the cut motions. He requests the Speaker to see that that procedure is adopted."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful for the advice given to me that I should deal in my reply with the matter raised in the cut motions. If I am to cover all the points raised, it depends on the amount of time I have, and how much time what I have to say on each point takes."

" Sir, I shall first of all refer to the observation of one of the Members who said that it was my pride that made me stick to this position and that otherwise I would have accepted the cut motion. I submit, Sir, that is not true. It is not my obstinacy, for I know that pride and obstinacy are deadly sins. I am not guilty of them in this connection."

" I now proceed to the form in which the cut motion has been worded and moved by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I hope he will not misunderstand me when I say that it is a clever party move on his part to do so. I shall explain why I apprehend it in that way. Mr. Viswanatham says that he is as fervent a believer in abstinence as ever before. In fact he took the word 'Prohibition' for 'abstinence'. He was a party to all our enthusiasms when the Prohibition Act was passed. But now, he says, he is convinced that this Prohibition cannot work. At the same time he says, he will suspend his judgment, and he wants a committee to inquire, not to find out the ways and means for enforcing it, but to see whether it is desirable to have that Act on our Statute Book. I submit if a man is thoroughly convinced, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition says he is, that Prohibition has failed and cannot be enforced, then the wording of the cut motion should be of a

17th July 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

different kind. It is no good to have a cut motion like the one he has moved. It should be of a different type. He says, 'I suspend my judgment', but all the same, he has expressed his judgment forcibly in his speech that he is convinced that Prohibition has failed. Yet he says, 'I shall suspend my judgment.' "

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" Take it as a tentative conclusion, and then; after the committee has submitted its report, we can come to the final conclusion."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" I do not object to the moral aspect of it at all. I am sorry my friend wants to put it as a tentative conclusion. What I submit is, I consider it again as the G.C.M. formula. (Laughter.) These Gentlemen, some of them, dare not tell the people that they do not want Prohibition. They would like to put it on the lower ground that it does not work well. There are some others who do not want Prohibition at all. All these cannot be got together on one motion except in the very clever manner in which it has been done in this cut motion. So that is the nature of the motion and I must explain why I oppose it. I oppose it because this is merely the process to get various dissimilar elements together not on their merits but by the greatest common measure tactics. Then, I immediately ask you to consider what Mr. Seethi Sahib has said. He has completely and fairly exposed it in a manner and in such clear terms which I cannot improve upon. If an inquiry is held into a matter in which we have not come to any conclusion and in which there is some doubt, I should not have objected to it. But really it is a suicidal move if I agree to it in this case. If ever I had any hope of continuing Prohibition and enforcing it, Government cannot achieve that object by an inquiry of that kind. If we consider the matter well, it will be seen that the appointment of a committee will clearly sabotage the whole scheme of Prohibition. For if I were to appoint a committee to make an inquiry, immediately there is not only a suspension of judgment on the part of the Leader of the Opposition but there will also be a suspension of the desire and interest in the whole movement itself throughout the country. The moment we announce that a committee has been formed to inquire into the desirability of a law, especially a law which deals with the conduct of the people in their private life and public welfare, and where it is not a clear-cut criminal issue, it means the death of that law, and it cannot be revived. For a thing can be revived only if there is some life left in it. Here, the moment a committee is appointed by this House, that very moment, I may say, the movement for total abstinence and the movement for Prohibition in this country would be killed outright."

" If hon. Members will bear with me, I shall show how it is. After an inquiry into a divorce case, the lady, however innocent, cannot come out free of blame. The lady's reputation dies with that inquiry. An inquiry into the desirability of Prohibition will be nothing short of that. The very idea that a number of legislators are hesitating, the very fact that there are doubts in the mind of the Government, the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[17th July 1952]

doubts and feels there is need for a committee, all these will mean the end of Prohibition so far as we are concerned, and we may as well close the shop once and for all. That is why I make a distinction between a straightforward motion opposing Prohibition and a motion like the present one."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" My motion is a very straightforward one. Because there was a sharp difference of opinion, I thought a committee was the best way of dealing with the matter. I am sorry, the Hon. Chief Minister does not think it is straightforward."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" The word 'straightforward' is objected to. Let me use the words 'direct opposition' to Prohibition. That could be understood by me and disposed of. If we start an inquiry, the House will be led to think that the question of Prohibition is still in doubt, and I say that the result of that will be the total killing of Prohibition. There are certain steps which are suicidal, and certain steps which will not hurt the ultimate object. If we had a common object, if all of us wanted Prohibition and if we only had some doubts, they could be cleared in this manner. But if we want a committee to inquire into the desirability of Prohibition and to go round the country, taking opinions, then immediately all the interests opposed to Prohibition will gather their forces and there will be nothing left of Prohibition. If it is true that enforcement has not been good, it will be worse as soon as this committee is appointed. When we appoint a committee, that moment the thing will be a corpse, i.e., the immediate result will be to reduce Prohibition to a corpse. What is the object of appointing a committee to inquire whether a corpse is alive? It is quite another matter to openly say, 'Let it become a corpse.' That is the straightforward attitude which I alluded to."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" What I said was that I would suspend my judgment not with regard to my conviction but on the question of the desirability of ending Prohibition immediately or otherwise, because the committee will report on all the matters. So far as I am concerned, I am suspending my judgment only on the desirability of the law."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" But unfortunately the suspension of the mind of the Government which the Leader of the Opposition desires will mean suspension of operations in regard to Prohibition and there will be no Prohibition left after that. That is why I bring the vivid analogy of the corpse. What is the use of calling in a doctor when in the very act we do something which kills the patient? I would not have opposed the motion except for the conviction that the appointment of a committee would kill Prohibition, not only in Madras but throughout India and throughout all countries in the world. We have introduced Prohibition here. If we agree to a committee of the kind proposed after so much time and labour spent on its working, it is sounding the death-knell of Prohibition in the State and in the Constitution itself.

17th July 1952]

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

" This takes me immediately to what the Constitution says. Article 47 of the Constitution was referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. He read it, I think, without making any difference between 'total abstinence' and 'total Prohibition.' 'Total abstinence' and 'total Prohibition' do not mean the same thing. The framers of the Constitution knew the distinction. 'Total abstinence' is the objective and 'total Prohibition' is a method for achieving it. If 'total abstinence' had been mentioned as the directive principle, I would have understood Sri Viswanatham's contention. This is how the article runs—

' 47. The State shall regard the raising of the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people and the improvement of public health as among its primary duties and, in particular, the State shall endeavour to bring about prohibition of the consumption except for medicinal purposes of intoxicating drinks and of drugs which are injurious to health.'

If the intention of the framers of the Constitution was what the Leader of the Opposition had suggested, the expression employed would have been 'to bring about total abstinence or non-use of liquor' and not 'to bring about Prohibition.' The directive in Article 47 is a definite directive towards statutory Prohibition and not merely a directive towards the goal of total abstinence. That does not mean that other measures should not be adopted or need not be adopted. The directive stated in the Constitution is clear, namely, that the idea of statutory Prohibition of intoxicating drinks, etc., is adopted, not as a justifiable Article, but as a Directive Principle and Article of Policy. Directive Articles of Policy are not less important than any other Articles in the Constitution.

" I may mention here, many years ago an All-parties Conference was held, and it finally ended in the Nehru Report on the Constitution. Even then an Article was adopted in the same terms, more or less, that there should be total Prohibition of intoxicating liquors and drugs. The Constitution has only reiterated that position of the Congress but it was unanimously accepted. I am not saying that, because the Directive Principle is there in the Constitution, we must stick to it, good or bad. The Directive Principle in the Constitution is in exactly the same terms as what we have done previously in this State; and the question therefore arises whether we should now take a step to reverse a policy and repeal a statute which has been adopted unanimously by the Madras Legislature and is now in force in the whole State, and whether the question should be reopened especially when, in the interval the Constituent Assembly has very recently adopted this same policy and made it a directive part of the Constitution for all States. In a State where we have already introduced Prohibition and worked it for a number of years there is greater reason why we should not think of going back than in other States where they have not introduced Prohibition. The other States could still consider whether they were ready for it or not, but in a State where Prohibition has been introduced long ago and, where it is now extended to cover the whole State, it would be not merely impolitic that we should reverse it but it would also be a wrong done to the Constitution, unless indeed we intend to reverse it not only in Madras but also intend to reverse the Direc-

11-45
a.m.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[17th July 1952]

tive Principle in the Constitution as a natural corollary. If, today we reverse Prohibition here it will have a far-reaching effect and I say that it will be a necessary corollary that the Directive Principle must also be cancelled and removed from the Constitution. There is no doubt about it. It is not possible to keep the Directive Principle in the Constitution if we reverse it in Madras.

“ Then, Sir, the main argument is that Prohibition is good but it has not been enforced properly or satisfactorily or to such an extent as to justify the continued efforts to keep it going. That is the sum and substance of the arguments. (Interruption.) I think I have put their arguments more correctly than they did. The argument of the other side, if it is followed, can only be that Prohibition has not been enforced, it has not been enforced satisfactorily, and it has been so unsatisfactory that there is no use keeping it going, and therefore it should be given up although it is good. I would like to say, without dwelling too long on these niceties of expression, that the debate should not be conducted like a debate among religious schools of philosophy. Let us proceed on the particular principles behind Prohibition and examine what is the difference between us and the Opposition. Is there anything in the world which is good, which we attempt to reach, and which we reach fully and completely? Nothing. I might say that it is a universally correct proposition that there is nothing in this world that is good which we can reach universally and without any blemish. Therefore my point is, ‘Has Prohibition failed so much that we should drop it?’ It was in August 1937 that we passed this Act amidst great enthusiasm. I think this Act was passed at midnight. We kept the debate going till midnight. We adopted not only this Act but we adopted two or three other great measures unanimously. Untouchability was abolished by this Legislature. Dare anyone say that we have enforced it completely? Dare anyone claim that we have removed untouchability in this country? Has not every village still a block of houses separate and subject to isolation and inconveniences? Are there not still wells which even some sections of the untouchables will not touch because another section of the untouchables are using it? Am I not a villager? I know all this. I can tell this House that in spite of our tall claims about abolition of untouchability, we have enforced Prohibition to a better extent than we have been able to enforce the abolition of untouchability. Now, dare anyone say, ‘This untouchability abolition is reeking with failure at every turn and therefore, will you please give up the attempt? It is good, but let us have an enquiry as to whether it is desirable to keep it or not on the basis of enforcement and not on the basis of its being good.’ May I be allowed to refer again to the fact that you dare not do it because of its political consequences? Can I not argue that in all these matters where ancient customs or ancient habits or hard, ingrained addictions are concerned, we succeed but gradually? We succeed surely though slowly. In all these cases the laws should not be removed for reasons of imperfect enforcement.

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

“The hon. the Leader of the Opposition appealed most fervently and in very good language—though I was not here, I followed every word that was said during the debate—in excellent and beautiful style that we should vote not according to party whips, but according to the dictates of our conviction. I agree. I want hon. Members on the other side to do the same. Do not look upon me as a political opponent and vote, but consider whether we can give up every good effort simply because we have failed and we have not succeeded. Let us not weigh in golden scales how much we have succeeded and how much we have failed when everything depends upon hearsay evidence. About twenty people spoke opposing Prohibition. Do any of them know what drink is? Have they drunk liquor? Do they know the amount of addiction associated with it? They do not know. That is the correct position. They are therefore not entitled to give any direct evidence in this matter. (An hon. Member: ‘Neither are you entitled.’) Anybody could rise and say, ‘Yes, I have drunk.’ I want him to say so, because even if a man had drunk only this morning he would tell me so as drink removes inhibitions, drink removes fear, drink removes political considerations—and wisdom sometimes—and only allows a man to speak what he knows, which is generally the truth. I therefore appeal to anyone who is now here with a certain amount of alcohol in his brain to come and tell me that this strong addiction, when once it takes hold of him, it is not easy to succeed in getting rid of. If Prohibition is good and we are to succeed, we should try, try and try again individually as well as socially. And this is what the Prohibition Act wants the people to do. I say, therefore, that it is wrong to claim, on the ground that it has not been enforced satisfactorily according to rumour and second or third-hand information without any evidence, that we should drop it now, which is the meaning of adopting this Cut Motion for making an enquiry. As I have already explained, Mr. P. T. Rajan said that so and so came and told him that Prohibition was not properly enforced. It is true they might have spoken as to what takes place. But I would like to know who they are.”

SRI P. T. RAJAN :—“Sir, not only had we been told by others but I know for myself that Prohibition is not strictly enforced.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“I know it myself but I was referring to what Sri P. T. Rajan said yesterday. I think I correctly followed him. He said that people had told him that such and such a thing had happened. It is always good to underestimate a thing, to put it a little below, so that we may not commit the mistake of exaggeration. We cannot always be in the golden mean; either we exaggerate or underestimate, and it is always safe to underestimate. But the majority of hon. Members who have spoken have given only their impressions. That no doubt is the business of the Legislative Assembly. I do not say it is wrong, but can we proceed on this basis to come to the conclusion that Prohibition has not been enforced properly? On the other hand, an equal number of people have risen and have strenuously and earnestly pleaded—they do not deny the facts suggested

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[17th July 1952]

by the other side, but they have seen some happiness and some prosperity on account of Prohibition—they have pleaded that it would not be right to discard prohibition. Therefore in these matters where we have to produce prosperity and create habits by various methods including legislation, we cannot remove a statute simply because we find that it has not been enforced to the extent to which we are entitled to ask that it should be enforced. (Interruption by Sri T. Viswanatham.) Please allow me to proceed. I am anticipating what you have to say and I will be coming to that in the course of the next one or two sentences.

“ Let us take now for purposes of comparison a question of psychology alone. Congress people throughout the State really feel very dejected that they have lost so many battles although they are here claiming to have enough majority to be in a position to control this House and govern this State for the time being. Still they feel greatly depressed because they had expected cent per cent success. If not cent per cent success, they had at least expected ninety per cent success. When they failed in so many places they feel dejected. The greater their expectations the greater their depression. In the same way if anybody believed that we will have cent per cent success in stopping the drink habit in our country by this legislation, he is disappointed. I see no surprise in this disappointment. Large numbers of us put our expectations so high that we feel greatly disappointed. But, what about untouchability? Their expectations were not much and they therefore think that we have succeeded a great deal. They not only say that we have succeeded but they think so and claim that it is so. It is but right that they think so.

“ Let me here confess to hon. Members that I knew it would be difficult to enforce Prohibition and I knew that it would not be a cent per cent success. If my speeches of that period are looked into, the Opposition will not be able to quote from them as they were able to quote from those of Sri Koti Reddi or Sri Gopala Reddi or others. I have made numerous speeches on this subject, official and non-official, and I never placed my expectations so high as some of my colleagues did. They thought ‘ here is a country with so many doctrines and so many good traditions in favour of Prohibition and we should therefore succeed.’ I only said that we would succeed much better than they did in America. I never expected cent per cent success. Like the Matriculation Examination candidate we have got only 45 per cent. Even if we succeeded only 45 per cent, I would say, give a pass to the Prohibition Act, because 45 per cent saved from drink is a great deal. Next year it may be 46 per cent, the year after 48 per cent, and then the time will come when the habit will have been forgotten. Just as we have forgotten many other things, we may forget this also; but two generations will have to pass really for a thing like the drink habit to disappear, and it is wrong for any Government or any Legislature to expect anything better than that. It does not justify any tinkering with the problem now on the ground that we have not succeeded as much as we wished or as much as we had expected. Take the law

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

against giving false evidence. The Leader of the Opposition referred in the same manner to some other matters, and therefore let us take this law, not the moral law about speaking the truth but the statutory law of perjury. Do not hon. Members, at any rate every lawyer present here, know that perjury is almost the rule in courts? There are two sides and there are two lawyers. There is the evidence of this side and of that side which have to be weighed against each other and the judge has to come to a conclusion. Now, I can very well say that the enforcement of the law of perjury, though on the whole it is not good enough, is a success. There are sections about it in the Indian Penal Code, and can we say that these sections must be removed because everyday we see stinking false evidence given in Courts? In fact, decisions are given based on false evidence, and very often we find that in appeal these are reversed. What does it mean? Can it be argued on this ground that a committee should be appointed to enquire whether it is desirable that the law of perjury is kept on or not, on account of its obvious failure in the Courts throughout? Now, I submit that the desirability of removing alcohol is no less important than the desirability of removing false evidence from Courts because falsehood in Courts affects only a certain class of litigants but drink affects the entire family, large communities and large classes of people. It is therefore a greater object than truth in Courts can ever be.

“ Therefore I say that we should not remove Prohibition, simply because, Member after Member, has got up to say that it has not succeeded. When we voted unanimously for the Prohibition Act, at midnight in the Senate House, it was not as if we gambled with enforcement as our stake. We said, ‘It is good and it may be enforced.’ We should, therefore, try still. It is not as if there was then a challenge and that we all said unanimously, ‘We will succeed. Therefore let us try.’ We said, ‘It is good; therefore let us try.’ We did not say, ‘We will succeed before 1952, when Congressmen will range themselves on opposite sides on account of splits in their ranks, when those that are sitting together as an unanimous body will be sitting on opposite sides and, unless then we prove this experiment to be a success to the hilt, we shall appoint a Committee.’ This Committee is a hangman for the Prohibition Act. It is far better that the prisoner is hanged straightway than that this Prohibition Act should be kept under the Committee of Enquiry, as it is called. I submit, therefore, Sir, that it is a wrong approach altogether. ”

12
noon.

“ May I tell hon. Members that I know something about the drink problem? I do not claim that it is a superior experience but it is a fact. It is not only when the Prohibition Act was passed that I thought about it, but even before I saw the face of Mahatma Gandhi, I was doing something in this matter. Many years before I became a politician I was dealing with this. As Municipal Chairman, Salem town, I had tried to remove toddy shops from one place to another and I had succeeded in making the District Collector agree that all toddy shops should be removed from the municipal limits and kept outside. I saw to it that the thirty

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[17th July 1952]

and odd toddy shops were reduced to six, and these six shops were placed round about the town. What did I see then—a regular car festival in every one of these six shops. A monopoly was created by the reduction in the number of shops and contractors became big men. These contractors kept beautiful lights in their shops and attracted people. Why I refer to this, is this. My experience is the basis of what I am now saying, whatever may be the rights and wrongs of the time when the Prohibition Act was passed. If hon. Members here had quarrelled with the Congress in 1937, and if they had sat on the opposite side and told us, 'This Prohibition Bill should not be passed; this will fail; do not go on with this,' we might probably have arrived at a different conclusion. But we adopted Prohibition then unanimously, and we have the Act now—the Prohibition Act.

"What will happen if we remove the Prohibition Act now? What has happened in other countries will happen here also. Mr. Nagi Reddi may get angry with me if I may mention the name of the country where it was tried before. What happened elsewhere will also happen here. I need not describe what will happen here the day when we appoint a Committee. There will be a regular orgy of drinking and misery all over the land. People will drink themselves to death. What is the meaning of the proposal for abolishing Prohibition? It will be to bring this country into a much greater mood of drinking than the people were in ever before. It may be right or it may be wrong to take a certain step, but when we retrace we should also know what it will mean.' During the last War, several Generals had to consider this aspect, namely, the effect of retracing the step once taken. Once having taken some wrong step, it is sometimes more wrong to retrace it. That is what I claim will happen in respect of the policy of Prohibition also. If any one wants to ruin the poor people of our country, ruin utterly the addicts who still persist in drinking, and who are still thinking of getting drinks somehow or other, then we should reverse Prohibition and bring them to that ruin. I cannot be a party to it. I cannot be a party to anything that brings it about indirectly also. Surely that is the effect of the Cut Motion.

"Then, the hon. Member Mr. P. T. Rajan put his case on a very moderate ground. He said, 'We do not ask for reversal of the policy of Prohibition. Here is an Opposition which asks only for a Committee of Enquiry.' He went further and thought—I read between the lines—that it would be wrong on our part not to co-operate with the Opposition to that extent. That was his principal point. It is no doubt good political wisdom. But Mr. Rajan is, if you will pardon me, Mr. Leader of the Opposition, too good to understand the tactics of the other side. (Interruptions from Mr. Nagi Reddi.) I understand the political side of it. Sir, I am 73, twice your age. I know all that you know and a little more.

"Sir, I know the contradiction in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition. It gives me a certain pain to make observations which apply to 99 but not to the hundredth man. The mind of the Leader of the Opposition is slightly different from those of the rest. He could not have spoken with that amount of fervour as he

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

did with regard to this basic matter of Prohibition and of abstinence unless he believed it was good and very strongly believed it was good. But he is in a peculiar position. He says that his fervour is no less than mine. But really that fervour has been converted into despair. That is the exact difference. He had a great desire for Prohibition being enforced, and he says, 'I still have the fervour.' What he really means is, he is now in great despair about it. I do not want to share that despair. That is the difference between him and me. I do not despair, I have not despaired and I do not think there is good reason to despair, because I know even if, among 100 people (taking a hundred of them) who are addicts, 40 of them are saved by this Act and the other 60 still drink because somebody tempts them, even then I say it is a good end and we must persist in it. Have not people, vastly greater than I, said that one soul saved is a valuable gain though 99 are not saved?

"Then the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Viswanatham, suggests, after shedding tears for the failure of a good cause like Prohibition, 'Let us make drunkenness an offence, if you like; but do not have Prohibition.' In the Abkari days, drunkenness was an offence. It was only drunkenness that was punished. Drunkenness meant something more than drink. If a man behaved in a drunken way, he was subject to punishment. Will that succeed now? Was that enforcement not tried before? All of us were dissatisfied with the enforcement of the law against drunkenness and unanimously we went over to Prohibition. The idea of failure is due to the exaggerated targets that we placed before our minds. Even with regard to the law relating to the commission of nuisances, to which a reference was made at the time of the question hour this morning, if a question had been asked when I was a Law student as to whether it had succeeded in stopping nuisances or not, I would have said, 'no'. It will never succeed completely. But after fifty years we find the City of Madras is much cleaner than it was ever before, thanks to the efforts of Mr. Vinayakam and others working in the Corporation of Madras. Attempts have been made not only to prosecute people committing nuisances but also to provide conveniences and to provide ways and means for the people to feel easy, over these matters, without infringing the law. The same thing should be done in the case of Prohibition law also. Then we shall succeed. We shall not succeed by accepting this cut motion.

"Sir, what does the advice given by the Opposition come to? It means, 'You, the Chief Minister, auction today and arrack shops and sell toddy and arrack to the people.' If they ask me to auction all the shops and divide the country's jurisdiction for King Toddy and King Arrack and I divide it and sell arrack and toddy, then I sell Government liquor with the seal of Government on it. Can I then prosecute the people for drunkenness? What is the object of prosecuting people for drunkenness? I have some experience of the propaganda carried on to bring about abstinence without the Prohibition Act. I have spoken to drinking people. They told me, 'Close the shop and we will stop drinking.' They not only said but believed that. In innumerable places they have

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [17th July 1952]

told me, 'Close the shop and then we will be able to control ourselves. So long as the toddy shop is here, we are drawn to it as if by iron chains.' That is the position of every one who has touched alcohol. After two months or a year, a person who gets into the clutches of this evil finds himself unable to get out so long as the temptation is there. Therefore, if I sell toddy or arrack and keep it, wherever there is population, wherever there are workers going along the road, in buildings constructed according to modern ideas, and place a few brilliant lights to attract people, can anybody be rightly prosecuted for drunkenness? If I make previous arrangements for people to get themselves drunk, how can anybody be justly prosecuted for drunkenness? I submit, Sir, it is impossible to accept the advice of the Leader of the Opposition.

"Sir, I must also explain why such a suggestion is put forward. It is because they have their eye on the revenue from drink. Otherwise these 'total abstainers' who are sitting before me would not ask for the repeal of the Prohibition Act. If there had been no revenue in it the position would have been totally different. I think, Sir, they would have all agreed with me unanimously and said, 'You are a good man. Go and try it.' It is the revenue in the drink that makes politics, and clouds their own arguments and their own reasoning, and makes them think that it is a good thing to keep toddy shops going.

"It is sometimes thought Government licensed toddy or arrack is healthier than other toddy or arrack. I ask, do hon. Members know what sanitary precautions are taken in the manufacture of licensed toddy? Nothing whatsoever. It is a superstition to imagine that Government licensed toddy is better than any other toddy or Government licensed arrack is better than any other arrack. The process is all the same and it is dirty or clean according to the way in which it is prepared. And in this country it is not going to make any difference so far as health or nutrition or their harmful qualities are concerned because Government sells it instead of other people doing it illegally.

"Then my hon. Friend was trying to argue, 'It is not a tax, because if you like, you drink; if you do not like, you do not drink.' I am surprised that he should have argued like that. But I am also not surprised because he does not know what drink is. If he knew it, he would agree with me, that it is not a tax but it is robbery. If you open a toddy shop near the B. & C. Mills and sell it to people when they return from their work, every worker will rush into the shop and drink. Thus it is not a tax but highway robbery. Are we entitled to carry on highway robbery? It is nothing short of that. It is worse than highway robbery. In highway robbery there is at least some resistance and some risk. Here you give a dope to the man which converts him into a slave at once. You remove the will from the man.

"Another queer argument was that we are giving some permits to the rich people, and why not give that 'benefit' to the poor also. A very good egalitarian argument! I am surprised it comes from those who want to help the poor. Now they ask, why I give it to the rich.

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

"I give it to him because I do not mind if he declares himself an addict. If he wants to ruin himself, so much less the burden to society. But the poor man who works, the poor man that works and produces, that he should be given the same 'benefits', I cannot agree. It is not a 'benefit' but an evil. While this is so, it may be complained and rightly complained, 'Why do you not keep the rich man away from it?' We do try to prevent him from drinking. But he says he will die without it and he produces a doctor's certificate. The reason why he dies is, that he is addicted to it. But in most cases the doctors and patients combine to see that they carry on in this process of dying. I know really that all the Latin terms which the doctors give in their certificates are the consequence of the addiction. (Laughter.) The alcohol has given him the disease and the prescription is to continue it. No medical book in the world would prescribe any dose of alcohol for any disease got otherwise than by addiction to alcohol. Whether the disease is real or something caused by the addiction, I cannot help it if they want to ruin themselves.

12-15
p.m.

"But, fortunately for us, apart from the fifteen or twenty Members who spoke about the failure of enforcement, an equal number of Members spoke about the opposite side also. Mr. Nalla Gounder spoke with personal knowledge. He spoke exactly as I would have spoken if I had been in his place. He saw the dangers of drink and described them clearly. Then, Swami Sahajananda also spoke. He also knows what drink is. He is not a man who wants revenue from drink. He knows what it means to his people if this revenue is got by destroying his people. He was in Salem with me, as I said, long before Mahatma Gandhi was there. We were there and have worked together. I was a native of the place and he was a visitor. He knows what drink is and what Prohibition is, and the evils that will follow to his people if Prohibition were scrapped. But after Mr. Seethi Saheb had spoken, there was no necessity for me to speak. But still I am speaking and it is but right that I should speak because many others have spoken notwithstanding Mr. Seethi Saheb's speech. Mr. Seethi Saheb said what he felt. He made his points better than I could have ever possibly made. I cannot find the style, the manner or conviction or the earnestness of purpose with which he expressed his views. There is no doubt that he was speaking from direct knowledge and direct feeling. I need not add anything more to what he said. But Mr. Anthony Pillai and the Raja of Vizianagaram, who are near about there, have also spoken. The Raja of Vizianagaram brought up some statistics. Young students of statistics are captivated by the figures. He tried to make out, as far as I could understand him, that the crime statistics and the drink statistics did not agree and, therefore, he argued that drink did not produce crime and that it had nothing to do with crime. I think that was the kind of argument he put forth."

SRI P. V. R. GAJAPATHI RAJU :—"Sir, I used two kinds of statistics with which I showed that the general crimes in the State had been on the upgrade since Prohibition was introduced. This was as far as the general crimes were concerned and I wanted

[Sri P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju] [17th July 1952]

to know from the Chief Minister whether he could explain this phenomenon of increase in crimes, existing with the introduction of Prohibition, apart from the increase in Prohibition crimes themselves year after year."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"The crime statistics, apart from the Prohibition crimes, show to the Raja of Vizianagaram that crimes are on the increase in spite of Prohibition. I grant it straightway. The crimes curve is different. Of the many causes of crime, drink is one. It may be one of the provoking causes. It is not the only cause. There are many causes for crime and to-day greed is the main cause for it."

SRI P. V. R. GAJAPATHI RAJU:—"I did not say, Sir, that it was Prohibition that brought about crime. It is drink that brought about crime, and it is the lack of drink, and the quest for acquisition of drink which is so great now, that have made persons addicted to it go to any extent to get it, and in the process of trying to get drink, they commit other crimes also. This was what happened in the United States of America also."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Now I have understood him. It is something better than what I had thought. (Laughter.) That is to say, he wants to prove that crime has many causes and that Prohibition itself causes crimes. I am not prepared to accept that statement. While I agree crime has many causes, drink is the de-inhibiting cause. Then, Sir, in his present short statement the Raja Sahab seems to suggest that it can be discerned by statisticians that there is some connexion between Prohibition and the increase in the number of crimes, and that because people are not allowed to drink licitly, the general crime curve goes up. Sir, these arguments are too mysterious for me to accept. There are clear and obvious reasons for the rise in the crime curve. To-day, after the War, as a result of inflation and many other causes following this War, crime has increased; every sort of crime has come to be committed. If drink had also been allowed in Madras—let me make a statement for what it is worth—crimes would have been much more. But I cannot prove a statement like this. That is only my estimate, and I know many will not accept that estimate. Everybody knows, however, that crimes have increased. I have read books on criminology, which means I have studied the experience of other people. I have had conversations with prisoners. There is a motive behind crime generally. It is not drink merely. The crime committed after a drink is generally to give a fatal blow to the friend that comes on his way in the road. To his mind, it is hardly a crime. There is a primary motive for the crime, as I said but before a person gives effect to it he is stopped by certain inhibitory influences. He asks himself, 'Shall I be arrested if I commit this crime? Will somebody arrest me, if I commit the crime? Shall I lose my place in society when I return? Shall I be taken back?' and so on. But once he takes the drink, he does not think of the consequences. He thinks, 'What does it matter to me if I am arrested and jailed? The consequences are shut out from minds of people who drink, and that is why people

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

are supposed to be brave after taking drinks and that is why it is supposed drink makes people adventurous. In that way, drink causes crime. It is the immediate de-inhibiting cause. Thus to a certain extent and in a limited sense, drink produces crime. And where is the result of the crime felt? In the house, in the family; ask the wife and ask the children how they are treated by the bread-winner, after he has taken a drink. That is not a crime which is punishable but it is something which is suffered quietly by the wives and the children, to their ruin.

“ Sir, the Raja of Vizianagaram went over to another very queer argument which I hope I have understood rightly. He said: ‘According to all calculations, if the Government got in 1937 six crores of rupees from drink and if that revenue has increased to about eighteen crores subsequently, it means that the industry itself has produced a commodity worth a hundred and thirty crores of rupees; and that industry, that large industry, which produced a hundred and thirty crores of rupees worth of commodity, you have stopped with your Prohibition.’ He further asked: ‘If I had produced a hundred and thirty crores of rupees worth of any other commodity, say textiles, would you have stopped it?’ That was the question he put, as I understood it. I submit, Sir, this is an amazing argument. One hundred and thirty crores of rupees worth of bad stuff, one hundred and thirty crores worth of poison, is not to be considered by the money value of it. The money value is put on it by the man who wants to exploit the poor. After all, is the stuff worth one hundred rupees? No. Because you produce addiction in the other man’s habits by doping him, it has become hundred crores of rupees worth. If the taxes were removed and the exploitation were removed, it would be worth much less. Nobody would look upon this as an industry at all. Here is an industry as the Raja Sahab has called it, and I know the Raja Sahab can start many industries in his lifetime; although he is to-day in the Socialist Party, he may do it. (Laughter.) Let me tell him, he will find various industries to start. Let him not start this industry. (Cheers.) Whatever the money value of the commodity, he will not start it, and that is my hope. There are industries where machinery has to be employed, where men have to be employed in large numbers and where stuff is produced, exported and so on. Here the main industry is toddy and arrack. Does the Raja Sahab want to start a toddy industry? (Laughter.) What does this industry cost? What does it require? If he does not know it, let me tell him. It requires a hut, a thatched hut, a leaky roof under which to sell the stuff, a coconut tree or a palm tree which somebody else has planted (laughter) and a third-rate ladder with which to climb. The man gets up the tree to a certain height with the help of the ladder and then goes up with the help of a rope and the muscles of his arm. This is the industry, and what is left there when one renter takes it over from another when the Abkari Officer transfers the shop? Nothing but broken mud pots. And the other man is ready to start the industry. This is the type of industry for which our mouths water and this is the industry upon which our tears are pouring, an industry of mud pots and leaky huts in

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [17th July 1952]

the countryside. Is this industry worth that name? The hon. Member must have read about the breweries and wine distilleries in other countries, where it is a costly industry and no poor man can afford to start one. But here it is the poorest man's industry and an industry of misery and ruin. It is an exploitation industry and nothing else, and I would earnestly pray for its being wiped out. I would make a present of any other industry for the Raja's consideration to take up when he can, but not this cheapest and the most destructive industry, the industry of toddy and arrack in India.

"Sir, another gentleman was referring to the dangers to the Ayurvedic science. I entirely agree with him that Ayurveda is a wonderful science. I was in close touch in Calcutta with big Ayurvedic doctors and I have still got three fine volumes of Charaka's books. There are asavas and asavams and nobody is going to interfere with them. The hon. Member was referring to some orders that had been passed and which had been taken to the courts. All those difficulties have been removed."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Only six of them have been allowed."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I know and that has been on the advice of very eminent doctors. Every toddy contractor can call himself an Ayurvedic doctor and say this is 'Narikela Asavam'. (Loud laughter.) That is not what we want to be done. But if there is any case for allowing any more of the asavams besides the six mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, I shall certainly consider it, because I know a little science. I know there are certain medical drugs and other stuffs which can be dissolved only in alcohol and not in water and that is why all these tinctures and the rest. They cannot be preserved in water and the asavam acts as preserver of certain medicinal drugs. They also act as enzymes, as tonic for the stomach. I may here refer to the opinion of MacCarrison who is a good authority on this subject. I consulted him many years ago on the enzymes in beer and toddy. He has said that there are other substances than toddy which also contain things like Vitamin B and so on and that in toddy the content of Vitamin B is very poor. There is a trace of it because it has not yet died. It would die in a higher percentage of alcohol than there is in toddy. In ordinary toddy, the alcohol is only 8 per cent. There are many other things where we can have the vitamins. We need not go to toddy for that. Fermented stuff can never contain more than about 12 per cent of alcohol because in the natural fermentation process alcohol ceases to exist and after the liquid reaches 12 per cent alcoholic strength, the solution gets converted into vinegar. It is no longer alcohol. There is therefore the maximum strength in fermented liquor. If you distil that 12 per cent stuff, you can get pure alcohol, and with that you can fortify any beverage to any strength. I should not teach hon. Members here how to make strong liquor. (Laughter.) There are ordinary Ayurvedic preparations and there are also those which contain a high percentage of alcohol. I may assure hon. Members that the Government will not step in anywhere where any regular Ayurvedic

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

medicine is made and given on prescription by qualified doctors. They should all be distributed by doctors and not sold by shopkeepers for beverage purposes. There are allopathic medicines too with alcohol in varying degrees. They are all distributed by doctors of one kind or another and not given away to workmen returning from the Buckingham Mills in Madras or from Harvey Mills in Madurai. They are to be distributed to people who are suffering from some illness and obtain a prescription from a doctor. And this will not cause any difficulty. There is no objection whatever to making every provision for the distribution of these on prescriptions.

12-30
p.m.

“ Sir, then reference was made to sweet toddy. I know it is very good. But sweet toddy is not the toddy they want. (Laughter.) It is nothing. It is only a weak syrup with a little flavour whether it is coconut juice or palmyra juice. Sweet toddy is good. It can be made into jaggery. That is why the Government of Madras have been struggling for some time past to form co-operative societies so that jaggery could be made. Because one man cannot make it, several should combine and there is check and counter-check in a co-operative society, so that it cannot be put to illicit use. But unfortunately in Malabar district, I understand now—I came back to this State after a long time—that there are difficulties in the formation of the co-operative societies. The villages there are of a different type. There men live far apart, each in his garden practically so to say. Therefore different arrangements have to be made for conversion of sweet toddy into jaggery or making any other use out of it. Government are quite prepared to consider such things and many other things like that for the enforcement of prohibition and removal of difficulties in the way of the honest manufacture and the use of these things.

“ Sir, my Friend Mr. Jeevanandam is not here. (An hon. Member: ‘He is there.’) He quoted from Kural—

‘ கனித்தானைக் காரணங் காட்டுதல் கீழ்நடிக்
குனித்தானைத் தித்தூரிடு யற்றி’

“ This is what he quoted which according to him means: ‘It is no use trying to reform a drunkard. Therefore scrap the Prohibition Act.’ This is what he said. It is a hopeless meaning that he gave to the verse. The meaning of the verse is: ‘If you drink you cannot afterwards be persuaded to give it up. Be, therefore, cautious even at the first time. Don’t drink because once you drink you are like a man who is immersed in water down below in the tank. If anybody wants to give you light, the light of understanding, he cannot bring the light to you, because the light would be extinguished straightway by the water.’ Thiruvalluvar said: ‘Drink attacks the brain, kills discrimination and judgment, and once they are lost there is no hope for that man.’ If I cut off my fingers, I have the discrimination left to go to a doctor. If I have pain in my stomach or any other ailment, my brain is not affected. I go to the doctor, take to diet regulation and the like. But if I take to drink, it attacks my judgment itself; I am like the man under water. It is no good going with a torch and searching for

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [17th July 1952]

him who is below, under the water. The torch would be extinguished by the water. That is what Thiruvalluvar wrote. He did not anticipate that hon. Members would start here this game against me and ask me to repeal the Prohibition Act. He did not say: 'For Heaven's sake do not try Prohibition because there is no use trying to reform the drunkards.' The whole of Thirukkural would be meaningless if this meaning were to be given to it. The whole of Thirukkural is based on the assumption that men could be reformed and that men could be protected, and that it is the duty of the State to do so. The whole book of Thirukkural is devoted to the duties of the Government, namely, to protect people against evil ways and habits. Therefore the hon. Member's eloquence—Mr. Jeevanandam was not far too eloquent either in this debate—was wasted, such as it was.

"Sir, the net result of the debate is that non-drunkards want the drink revenue. To put it briefly and shortly it means that non-drunkards of the State through their elected representatives—half of them that are on the other side—want the drink revenue. I submit, Sir, it is not a right claim. It is not right to do such a thing. Sir, one Communist Member made a special appeal to me. He wanted to appeal to me saying: 'You have gained the hearts of the people by de-control. De-prohibit, and you will gain more hearts and you will be a great man'. The appeal, I am sorry to say, was lost on me. I think it would be wrong for me to gain any heart by removing Prohibition. That is not my way of helping the poor. That may be the way of helping the poor in the opinion of some other people, as Swami Sahajananda explained and deprecated. The way in which I help and gain their hearts is very often by going against their worse judgment. I want to gain them by doing the right and good thing. And Prohibition is a good thing that helps and it should not be removed. I would be a robber and wicked man if I removed Prohibition.

"What my friends do not understand is this. What is the basic cause that contributed to the success of so many Communist Members here and so many others? It is Prohibition. I say, the men were free to judge, they were independent, they were not intimidated by landlords and the tyrants in the village. They were free agents. Now you want to remove Prohibition and let them drink toddy and arrack and lose their freedom. I am not interested in politics so much all the time, though I may seem to be a hard-boiled politician. I am really interested in the people of my country. I ask the Members on the other side not to make the mistake of scrapping Prohibition. It is easy to vote and reduce the majority but they will be ruining their clientele. This is not the way to represent the set of people whom they want to improve in life. Sir, I am helping them and not they. That is what I say to them. Sir, I am going to end with this. That is not the way of helping the people. I have lived in a village where the rich tyrant of the village gave me a piece of land to construct my Ashram. He and his partners were running a toddy shop. He did not like Prohibition, because that would end his power over the people. There is nothing by which you can govern poor people as through

17th July 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

toddy shops. That is the secret which the tyrants of the land knew very well. I want you to end that tyranny; I want you to make that revolution. Don't allow this Government to remove the Act from the Statute Book. That would be the ruin of all villages.

"Sir, Swami Sahajananda, I think, said: 'Make me a Minister for a little while. I will make it succeed.' If only I believed him, that is to say, if I believed he could do it, I would have no difficulty in taking him. (An hon. Member: 'Why not take Mr. Seethi Sahib.') He will not have the influence which Mr. Sahajananda has over his people. Don't think that you can get away with it. It is a bad remark to make but I will answer it. The majority of the people who drink in our country are people who belong to the class similar to that to which Swami Sahajananda belongs. He has a claim over them; he has a moral control over them. He will be more useful to me as a Minister than Mr. Seethi Sahib. His people don't drink in Malabar. Muslims are pretty good there. They don't drink. They have not yet broken their scriptures. In other parts I know they have. In Malabar they have not done it. I hope they will continue in the same state. But if Mr. Seethi Sahib be taken into my Cabinet, I know he would be of immense help to us. He would be as good as or any other Member here. I have no doubt about it. But it is a cheap thing to say that because the Leader of the Muslim League has supported this cut motion, his name should be brought in by way of a jibe in this manner. It is a sign of youth. I hope hon. Members will get rid of it in course of time.

"Let me wind up with a special appeal. In history men may fail but men tried. What did Lenin do? (An hon. Member: 'He did not succeed.') Didn't I anticipate that? What did Lenin do? The moment the revolution was successful, that very day he came to this conclusion and said: 'I must stop the drink evil.' Thousands of bottles were broken, barrels after barrels were discharged into the river Neva. Why did he do it? And can I not be allowed to have the same desire, the same judgment and understanding for some little time? The Russian people historically have been known to be great drinkers. They have been attached to alcohol for ages. They were so attached to it that many attempts made by Emperors failed. Lenin too tried hard. He also failed. But remember Lenin prohibited in 1917, not only vodka which corresponds to our arrack but also wine, beer and everything else containing alcohol. He thought: 'Yes, revolution hands over power to the people, the proletariat, but drink is the enemy of wisdom, the enemy of the proletariat'. That is exactly what I say. I say: 'Here, power has been transferred to the people and I do not want drink to be allowed to the people to ruin their understanding and their freedom.' I hope hon. Members will vote according to the conviction of their minds. This 'committee resolution' is a dangerous resolution. I repeat again, it means the killing of Prohibition today, here and now, when we accept it. To abstain from voting is abstention from duty. I want hon. Members to vote out the cut motion and accept the Demand." (Cheers.)

[17th July 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I want to say a few words before . . . ”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The hon. Leader of the Opposition says that I have the last word in everything but I find he has always the last word in everything.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Hon. Members must know that a Member who moves a cut motion has no right to a second speech. I want to know whether the hon. Member withdraws his cut motion.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, I am convinced more than ever that the Hon. the Chief Minister has not cared to look at the problem from the realistic point of view. He said that I looked at it from the political point of view. I sincerely believe that I viewed it from the practical and realistic point of view. I believe the suggestion to have a committee does not commit anyone to any particular point of view, but that it would satisfy the needs of everybody having different views. So, Sir, I am convinced that my cut motion is right and proper.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ If you will permit me to have a word, Sir, I again say that it may be possible that I have judged wrongly of the hon. Member's intentions in the matter. But I have said enough and I repeat again as an answer that accepting the cut motion, whatever might be the intention, will ruin Prohibition and would mean cancelling it now, and it would be a disgrace to keep an Act on the Statute Book after this motion is accepted. I say it is a bad move.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I say mine is not a political or a party point of view.”

12.45 p.m. MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am going to put the cut motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ That the allotment of Rs. 77,91,100 for State Excise Duties be reduced by Rs. 100.’ ”

The motion was declared lost.

Sri T. Viswanatham demanded a poll.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Hon. Ministers who are Members of the Legislative Council will please take their seats on the dais.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ On a point of information, Sir. Members of the Government Party are going to other benches and canvassing support. Is it allowed? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ They cannot canvass. I wish to inform hon. Members that till the results are announced nobody should leave his seat.”

17th July 1952]

The House then divided thus :

Ayes.

Sri P. T. Rajan.
 Dr. K. B. Menon.
 Sri M. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.
 „ P. V. R. Gajapathi Raju.
 „ C. V. Somayajulu.
 „ Padmaprabha Gounder.
 „ S. Pakkirisami Pillai.
 „ K. R. Nallasivam.
 Janab K. Moidu.
 Sri K. V. S. Padmanabha Raju.
 „ K. Venkatakurmi Nayudu.
 „ C. Velukkan.
 „ G. Suryanarayana.
 „ H. B. Ari Gowder.
 „ P. Chinna Reddi.
 „ K. Venkata Setty.
 „ R. Rangaswamy Gounder.
 „ V. Govindaswamy Naidu.
 „ O. Chencam Pillai.
 „ M. Dharmalingam.
 „ V. Chidanandam.
 „ M. Subba Reddi.
 „ M. Bapiah Choudary.
 „ M. P. Mangala Gounder.
 „ K. S. Lakshminpathy Naicker.
 „ N. Rathina Gounder.
 „ M. Lakshmanasamy.
 „ B. Sankarappa.
 „ N. K. Palanisami.
 „ G. Bapanayya.
 „ G. Yallamanda Reddi.
 „ P. K. Gopalakrishnan.
 „ K. C. Gopalan Unni.
 „ M. Kalyanasundaram.
 „ K. T. Raju.
 „ K. P. Gopalan.
 „ P. Jeevanandam.
 „ C. Kandasami.
 „ S. Vadivelu.
 „ V. Madanagopal.
 „ S. Ramalingam.
 „ N. Sivaraj.
 „ A. K. Subbiah.
 „ K. V. Ramasamy.
 „ T. S. Arthanari.
 „ P. Venkatesha Sholagar.
 „ P. Narasimha Reddi.
 „ N. Sivarami Reddi.
 „ D. Seetharamiah.
 „ C. H. Kanaran.
 „ K. Madhan Nambiar.
 „ R. Krishnan.
 „ E. T. Kunhan.
 „ M. Hanumantha Rao.
 „ P. Venkatasiviah.
 „ K. Rajagopala Rao.
 „ C. Venkatakrishna Rao.
 „ P. Rama Rao.
 „ V. Rama Rao.
 „ T. Potha Raju.
 „ P. S. Ramachandra Rao.
 „ K. Malakondaiah.
 „ M. Narayanasamy.
 „ K. Venkaiah.
 „ P. Syamasundara Rao.
 „ B. Lakshminarasa Raju.

Sri G. Satyanarayana.
 „ G. Anjaneyalu.
 „ V. Sri Krishna.
 „ G. Joseph.
 „ D. Lakshmayya.
 „ M. Kune Rao.
 „ G. Nageshwara Rao.
 „ Alluri Venkataramaraju.
 „ R. Venkata Jagga Rao.
 „ K. Ranga Rao.
 „ K. Subba Reddi.
 „ Chandra Ramalingaiah.
 „ C. Prabhakara Choudary.
 „ G. Rama Rao.
 „ K. Govinda Rao.
 „ M. Veerabhadram.
 „ S. S. Ramasamy Padayachi.
 „ V. V. Ramasami.
 „ S. Swayamprakasam.
 „ K. Vinayakam.
 „ E. L. Raghava Mudaliar.
 „ Mookiah Thevar.
 „ P. Rathinaswami Pillai.
 „ A. Doraiswami Gounder.
 „ K. Krishna Rao.
 „ M. Palaniandi.
 „ V. R. Krishna Ayyar.
 „ T. Shanmugam.
 „ P. Rangaswami Reddiar.
 „ Vavilala Gopalakrishniah.
 „ Mottaya Kudumban.
 „ M. P. Subramaniam.
 „ Lakshminarayana Reddi.
 „ N. Paramasiva Udayar.
 „ D. Krishnamurthi Gounder.
 „ G. C. Kondayya.
 „ P. Kandasamy Gounder.
 „ D. K. Raja.
 „ M. Manickasundaram.
 „ S. P. Trangavelu.
 „ P. R. Rajagopala Gounder.
 „ S. Kasi Reddi.
 „ K. R. Sambandam.
 „ V. T. Elaya Pillay.
 „ P. Chokkalingam.
 „ T. Nagi Reddi.
 „ Pillalamarri Venkateswarlu.
 „ S. T. Adityan.
 „ S. Deivasigamany.
 „ Y. Audinarayana Reddi.
 „ Bojja Appalaswami.
 „ D. Dasarathan.
 „ S. Vemiah.
 „ R. Siddanna Gowd.
 „ Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur.
 „ N. V. L. Narasimha Rao.
 „ K. Ramiah Chowdary.
 „ S. S. Kolkebail.
 „ Y. V. Krishna Rao.
 „ P. Suryachandra Rao.
 „ D. Basivi Reddi.
 „ K. Bapanna Dora.
 „ K. Ramaiah.
 „ K. Gajapathi Reddi.
 „ C. Pulla Reddi.
 „ T. Viswantham.
 „ P. Ramamurthi.

[17th July 1952]

Ayes—cont.

Sri P. B. K. Rajachidambaram.
 „ V. R. Nagarajan.
 „ T. C. Narayana Nambiar.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.
 „ N. Paramasivam.
 „ A. Govindasamy Nayagar.
 „ K. Aranganathan.

Sri M. Jagannathan.
 „ M. Palanimuthu.
 „ A. Ayyaru.
 „ S. Radhakrishnan.
 „ A. Muthuswami.
 „ T. D. Muthukumaraswamy Naidu.

1 p.m.

Noes.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
 „ A. B. Shetty.
 „ M. A. Manickavelu
 Naicker.
 „ Dr. U. Krishna Rao.

Sri K. Rajaram.
 „ B. Bakthavatsalu Naidu.
 „ C. Rajam Ramasami.
 „ P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ B. K. Nallasamy.
 „ S. C. Virupakshayya.
 „ P. S. Nalla Gounder.
 „ P. G. Manickam.
 „ R. Kuppuswami.
 „ P. K. Thirumurthi.
 „ V. K. Palanisami Gounder.
 „ N. Mounaguruswamy Naidu.
 „ P. S. Rangasamy Naidu.
 „ S. R. Arumugam.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ Kempai Gounder.
 „ T. M. Kaliannan.
 „ M. P. Pariasami.
 „ Ardhanareswara Gounder.
 „ A. Sambasivam.
 „ Lakshmana Kandar.

Dr. P. Varadarajulu Naidu.
 The Hon. Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan
 Nayar.

„ Dr. R. Nagan Gouda.
 Sri N. Ramakrishna Ayyar.
 „ T. N. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ K. Koti Reddi.
 „ A. M. Sambandam.
 „ M. R. Ramachandran.
 „ O. Venkatasubba Reddi.
 „ B. Parameswaran.
 „ V. K. Ramasamy Mudaliar.
 „ T. P. Elumalai.
 „ S. Panchaksharam.
 „ A. J. Arunachalla Mudaliar.
 „ A. K. Masilemani Chettiar.
 „ H. M. Jagannatham.

Janab S. Khadir Sheriff.

Sri A. Ramachandra Reddiar.
 „ R. Thangavelu.
 „ R. A. Nataraja Mudaliar.
 „ M. Kandasamy Padayachi.
 „ L. Anandan.
 „ V. Krishnasami Padayachi.
 „ G. Vagheesam Pillay.
 „ A. S. Sahajanandam.
 „ O. A. Nanjappa.
 „ P. M. Munuswamy Gounder.
 „ S. Arumugam.
 „ K. S. Subramaniam Gounder.
 „ A. M. Ratnaswami.
 „ M. Masimuthu.

Janab Mohamed Salih Maraikayar.

The Hon. Sri V. C. Palanisami
 Gounder.
 „ K. Venkataswamy Naidu.

The Hon. Sri N. Sankara Reddi
 „ D. Sanjivayya.
 „ Shanmuga Rajeswara
 Sethupathi (Raja of
 Ramanathapuram).
 „ S. B. P. Pattabhi Rama
 Rao.

Dr. T. S. Soundaram Ramachandran.
 Srimathi Thamma Kotamma Reddi.
 Sri M. S. Munisami Pillai.
 „ C. Chinnasami Naidu.
 „ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
 „ V. S. Sivaprakasam.
 „ B. R. M. Muthu Thevar.
 „ A. Ayyanar.
 „ V. Muthu.
 „ A. S. Subbaraj.
 „ S. Thinakarasaamy Thevar.
 „ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
 „ S. Jayaram Reddi.
 „ Vaikuntam.
 „ G. Govindan.
 „ P. S. Krishnasamy Ayyangar.
 „ S. Ramasamy Naidu.
 „ Ar. A. Rm. Chockalingam Chettiar.
 „ P. Chellathurai.
 „ N. Rajagopal.
 „ R. M. Palaniappan.
 „ A. Ramasamy Thevar.
 „ T. K. Rama.
 „ T. V. Sannasi.
 „ Anthony Peter.
 „ T. R. Varadan.
 „ C. Muthiah Pillai.
 „ M. P. Thiegaraja Pillai.
 „ S. Venkatarama Ayyar.
 „ R. V. Swaminathan.
 „ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
 „ K. T. Kosaiaram.
 „ P. Urkavalan.
 „ T. Ganapathv.
 „ M. G. Shankar.
 „ Venugopalakrishnasamy.
 „ S. Somayajulu.
 „ M. Chinnathambi Thevar.
 „ P. Selvaraj.
 „ V. Arumugam.
 „ K. Ramasamy Doss.
 „ R. S. Arumugham.
 „ A. Venkatramiah.
 „ A. Rami Reddi.
 „ N. Chenchurama Naidu.
 „ D. Dasaradha Ramaiah Naidu.
 „ P. Gopalakrishna Reddi.
 „ K. Shanmughan.
 „ P. Venkataswami Reddi.
 „ M. C. Muthukumarasamy.
 „ G. Narayanasami Naidu.
 „ Ch. S. R. Ch. V. P. Murthi Raju.
 „ Raja V. V. Krishnam Raju.
 „ T. Ramaswamy.
 „ P. Satyanarayana Reddi.

17th July 1952]

Noes—cont.

Sri V. Durgaprasad Veerabhadra Deo Bahadur.	Sri K. Ishwara.
„ P. Gunnayya.	„ N. N. Suvarna.
„ L. Lakshmana Das.	„ L. C. Pais.
„ K. Suryanarayana.	„ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
„ P. Sangam Naidu.	„ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
„ Raja Sagi Suryanarayana Raju.	„ M. S. Mogral.
„ P. Venkatasubbiah.	„ K. Veeranna Padal.
„ K. V. Vema Reddi.	„ V. Darmalinga Nayakar.
„ G. Sivasankara Reddi.	„ N. C. Ramasamy Kander.
„ S. Narayanappa.	„ Somasundara Gounder.
„ K. Santhappa.	Janab K. Uppi.
„ P. Ranga Reddi.	Sri M. Chadayan.
„ N. Gopala Menon.	Janab C. Ahmed Kutti.
„ A. Appu.	„ Kunhi Mohamed Shaffee.
„ B. Krishnamoorthy Row.	„ K. M. Seethi.
„ A. Balarama Reddi.	Sri G. Samia Koorayer.
„ D. Ramabrahmam.	„ V. Balakrishnan.
„ K. Adikesavalu Naidu.	„ M. Rajeswara Rao.
„ H. Ramalinga Reddi.	„ A. Veloo.
„ G. Nagabhushanam.	„ C. Subbarayudu.
„ Ijari Sirasappa.	„ P. Kotaiah.
„ Kotra Basayana Goud.	„ V. Sankaranarayana Menon.
„ T. Malliah.	„ K. T. Sridharan.
„ T. Anantha Pai.	„ M. Narayana Kurup.
„ Y. Manjaya Shetty.	„ M. Narayana Nambiar.
„ K. Venkataramana Gowda.	„ C. Kunhirama Kurup.

Neutral.

Sri P. Thimma Reddi.	Sri P. Pundarikakshacharyulu.
„ G. Latchanna.	„ K. V. Ramesam.
„ M. Muni Reddi.	„ M. Srungaram.
„ K. Appala Naidu.	„ K. Venkatanarayana Dora.
„ P. Bapu Naidu.	„ N. Venkatayya.
„ B. Gangayya Naidu.	„ M. Gangappa.
„ K. Narayana.	„ M. Pentannaidu.

Ayes : 147; Noes : 170; Neutral : 14.

The cut motion was lost.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I shall now put the original motion to the vote of the House. The question is—

‘ That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 77,91,100 under Demand II—State Excise Duties.’ ”

The Demand was carried and the Grant was made.

(2) DEMAND XIV—POLICE.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

‘ That the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 7,10,82,100 under Demand XIV—Police.’ ”

“ Sir, the Demand for the year 1952-53 is slightly higher than the Demand for 1951-52 but the Demand provides for only normal expenditure. Certain hon. Members have complained that the Police Budget is on the increase. It is true that the Police Budget as it stands to-day, is higher than what it was prior to 1945-46. The increase in expenditure is due to the periodical revision of

1-15
p.m.